





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,975	03/07/2002	Shu-Ming Liu	STCP0008USA	9291
27765	7590 08/23/2004		EXAM	NER
NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE) P.O. BOX 506			SHAPIRO, LEONID	
	MERRIFIELD, VA 22116		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2673	8
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<del>-</del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/683,975	LIU, SHU-MING			
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Leonid Shapiro	2673			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	<u>une 2004</u> .				
·	<u> </u>	s action is non-final.				
3)□	· —					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□	,,,,,,,,,,,					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachmen		<b>"□</b> -	(PTO 440)			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:				

Art Unit: 2673

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Newly introduced limitation recited: " and when the computer system prompts the user for input data ...". It is not clear, why and how the computer system prompts the user for input data, when user personal data already available in the memory of the voice input module.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan (US Patent No. 6, 404, 859 B1) in view of Ausems et al. (US Patent No. 6,434,403 B1) and Carman (Pub. No.: US 2003/0046567 A1).

As to claim 1, as best understood by examiner, Hasan teaches a portable voice input module (Fig. 1, item 12) capable of connecting to a computer system (See Fig. 1, items 12, 14, 16, Col. 3, Lines 33-47), the computer system comprising a language processing program for translating voice signals inputted from voice input module into

Art Unit: 2673

corresponding computer commands (See Fig. 1, item 20, Col. 4, Lines 48-65), the voice input module comprising: a microphone for processing voice command spoken by a user to voice signal (See Fig. 1, items 10, 15, Col. 3, Lines 48-50); wherein when the voice input module connects to the computer system and when the a language processing program of the computer system translates the voice signals inputted from the voice input module into corresponding computer commands, the computer system executes the computer commands (See Fig. 1, items 12, 14, 16, Col. 3, Lines 33-47).the voice

Hasan does not show a memory for storing personal data by the user in a portable input module, the computer system is capable of retrieving the personal data stored in the memory and utilize the personal data stored in the memory of input module to complete the computer commands.

Ausems et al. teaches a memory for storing personal data by the user in a portable input module (See Fig. 3, items 310, 320, Col. 7, Lines 53-59), the computer system is capable of retrieving the personal data stored in the memory (See Fig. 2, items 100, 270, 210, Col. 9, Lines 17-21) and utilize the personal data stored in the memory of input module to complete the computer commands (See Figs. 2-3, items 100, 210, 270, 330, Col. 9, Lines 23-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the teaching of Ausems et al. into Hasan apparatus in order to exchange data with remote computer via the wireless telephone engine (See Col. 2, Lines 1-2 in Ausems et al. reference).

Art Unit: 2673

Hasan and Ausems et al. do not show when computer prompts the user for input data, the computer system utilizes personal data stored in the memory for supplying the input data.

Carman teaches when computer prompts the user for input data, the computer system utilizes personal data stored in the memory for supplying the input data (See Fig. 6, items 602-603, page 3, paragraph 0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the teaching of Carman into Ausems et al. and Hasan system in order to implement electronic password protection (See page 1, paragraph 0002 in Carman reference).

As to claim 2, Hasan teaches the computer system connected to internet (See Fig. 1, item 32), the voice commands spoken by the user commands to read a mail of the user and when the language processing program of computer system identifies the voice commands spoken by the user comprise commands to read the mail, the computer system executes the commands (See Fig. 1, items 20, 22, 24, from Col. 3, Line 48 to Col. 4, Line 55); and Ausems et al. teaches the personal data stored in the memory of the voice input module comprise the contents of address book of user (See Fig. 2, item 270, Col. 9, Lines 18-23) and utilizes the mail address stored in the memory of the voice input module to complete the computer command (See Figs. 2-3, items 100, 210, 270, 330, Col. 9, Lines 23-30).

As to claim 3, Hasan teaches that after the computer system reads the mail of the user, the computer system transforms the mail by text-to speech converter (the

Art Unit: 2673

language processing program) to voice signals and outputs the voice signals (see Fig. 1, items 28, 30, 10, Col. 4, Lines 16-55); and Ausems et al. teaches a speaker for transforming the voice signals to sounds (See Fig. 1b, item 135).

As to claim 9, Hasan teaches the voice input module comprise a mobile phone (See Fig. 1, item 10, Col. 3, Line 34).

3. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan, Carman and Ausems et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Xie (Pub. No.: US 2003/0078803 A1).

Hasan, Carman and Ausems et al. do not show language processing program uses the voice command database to analyze the voice commands inputted by the voce input module to translate the voice commands to corresponding computer commands updated from internet.

Xie teaches a voice command processing system connected to internet which is more extensive than data base in storage and to analyze the voice commands to translate the voice commands to corresponding computer commands updated from internet (See Fig. 1, items 220, 230, pages 4-5, paragraph 0033 and page 7, paragraph 0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use voice command database and internet as shown by Xie into Hasan, Carman and Ausems et al. apparatus in order to increase the range of applications...

Art Unit: 2673

4. Claims 6-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan, Carman and Ausems et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Luisi (Pub. No.: US 2002/0169617 A1).

Hasan and Ausems et al. do not show wire connection to computer system using universal serial bus (USB).

Luisi teaches a wire connection of the voice input module to the computer system using universal serial bus (USB) (See Fig. 1, items 100, 124, page 2, paragraph 0019).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use universal serial bus (USB) wire connection as shown by Luisi in Hasan, Carman and Ausems et al. apparatus in order to implement menu-driven voice control in a game environment (See page 1, paragraph 0007 in Luisi reference).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan, Luisi, Carman and Ausems et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Chihara et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0068600 A1).

Hasan, Luisi, Carman and Ausems et al. do not show wireless connection uses a bluetooth communication protocol.

Chihara et al. teaches wireless connection uses a bluetooth communication protocol (See Fig. 9, items 72, 74, page 7, paragraph 0080).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use bluetooth communication protocol for wireless connection as shown by

Art Unit: 2673

Chihara et al. in Hasan, Luisi, Carman and Ausems et al. apparatus in order to transmit information received from headset through the second communication link (See page 3, paragraph 0025).

Page 7

# Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 06-10-04 with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/683,975 Page 8

Art Unit: 2673

# Telephone inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ls 08.09.04

VIJAY SHANKAR PRIMARY EXAMINER